

### Remarks

Claims 1-55 are currently pending and stand rejected. No claims have been amended. Applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

### Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on September 28, 2004. During the interview, deficiencies in the Cain reference were discussed relative to claim recitations of the present invention. Namely, it was discussed that Cain deals with feature modules providing features for a single switch, and that the processor of Cain is for a single switch and interacts with the feature modules for the single switch so that features are provided appropriately for a call being handled by the switch. It was further noted that Cain fails to disclose comparing feature packages of two different switches since Cain is interested in the interaction of features of a single switch.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 1-55 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Cain (US Pat 5,448,631). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

### Claims 1-55

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-55 by stating that Cain discloses all of the elements. However, each of claims 1-55 include recitations of feature packages of two different switches and a comparison of the feature packages of the two switches. Cain, on the other hand, is concerned with features of a single switch and how those features interact during a call being handled by the single switch.

As noted at col. 2, line 47 of Cain, each switch includes a basic call processor that communicates with a feature manager. As noted at col. 3, line 57, the feature manager is either internal to the switch or interfaces with the switch. Furthermore, at col. 4, line 37-43, the feature modules are software routines, not switches, that are implemented in the existing switch control software packages that are used by the switch to handle calls. Thus, FIG. 1 is essentially showing the contents of a single switch. Col. 4, lines 26-36

discuss that during a call being handled by a switch, the call processor of the switch sends an event message to the feature manager, the feature manager then invokes a feature module by sending the event message to the module, and then the feature manager receives a return message from the module. It is this process that allows the feature manager to control the interaction of features provided by feature modules during the call being handled by the switch that includes the basic call processor, feature manager, and feature modules.

Cain is focused on the features of a single switch and their interaction during a call. Cain does not disclose multiple switches, each having its own feature package, where a comparison of the feature packages of two switches is performed. As Cain is interested in what happens at a single switch, there is no reason and no mechanism disclosed by Cain for comparing feature packages of two switches. Accordingly, Cain fails to teach all of the recitations of claims 1-55 for at least these and other reasons. Therefore, claims 1-55 are allowable over Cain.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-55 is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2004



Jeramie J. Keys  
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(404) 849.2093